

26 APR 1978

U.S. Escalates War in Laos, Hill Discloses

By Murrey Marder
Washington Post Staff Writer

The United States is engaged in "heavy escalation" of its air war in Laos while trying to de-escalate the war in Vietnam, a Senate inquiry disclosed yesterday.

When the American bombing of North Vietnam ended on Nov. 1, 1968, U.S. air power shifted to hit the predominantly North Vietnamese troops in Laos, the record shows. The U.S. bombing of Laos, testified William H. Sullivan, former ambassador in Laos and now assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs.

A Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee headed by Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) yesterday made public the censored results of a six-month struggle with the Executive Branch over releasing testimony taken last October about the secret U.S. role in Laos.

It shows that by agreement with Laotian Premier Souvanna Phouma, the United States responded in 1964 to Vietnamese Communist violations of the 1962 Geneva accords on Laotian neutrality by violating them too. The U.S. share of this decision has cost "billions of dollars," and about 200 American lives, the record indicates.

Under the covert U.S. operation, the American Ambassador in Vientiane virtually has operated as co-commander of the war in northern Laos; he controls a U.S. mission of air, ground and intelligence advisers that coordinates American and Laotian air and ground operations in northern Laos; arranges for the training (primarily at American bases in Thailand) of Lao troops, and supplies American military and economic funds to Laos that are larger than the Laotians' own contribution to their nation's economy.

The Laotian Premier "made it clear that he wanted us to say as little as possible about American military action in

Laos, testified William H. Sullivan, former ambassador in Laos and now assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs.

After more than 100 meetings with administration officials, Symington's subcommittee on U.S. commitments abroad salvaged 237 pages of censored transcript.

President Nixon pierced the censorship deadlock when he disclosed, on March 6, a few selected portions of U.S. activities in Laos, emphasizing that they began under "two previous administrations."

But the new record shows that the war in Laos involves far more than "1,040 Americans . . . stationed in Laos" as the President's guarded statement listed.

The hearings disclose, as subcommittee sources put it that "tens of thousands" of Americans are involved in the Laotian war in air combat, in training, advisory, supply and intelligence work — operating from Thailand, from South Vietnam and from U.S. aircraft carriers at sea.

Symington expressed the hope, in making the transcript public, that it will help prevent "another Vietnam."

No conclusions or findings accompany the report, partly because it is incomplete. The subcommittee staff noted that it had gained release of 90 percent of the transcript, but chief consultant Walter H. Pincus stated in a covering letter that the public's "right to know" is still being abused to avoid "embarrassing past administrations or officials for

reasons unrelated to national security.

Censorship took out of the transcript all summary figures on costs; every reference to the Central Intelligence Agency's operations, which include training, equipping, supplying and directing Gen. Vang Pao's "clandestine" army of up to 36,000 Meo tribesmen in Laos; all references to the use of Thailand's forces in Laos; details on U.S. air operations from Laos; figures showing the escalation of American air strikes in Laos during bombing "pauses" or the halt in the air war against North Vietnam, and other critical facts.

Portions of the story can be reconstructed or estimated, however, despite the deletions. A typical deletion in the transcript reads:

"The total cost of all U.S. activities in Laos, including air operations against the Ho Chi Minh Trail, is about (deleted) billion a year. Of this, approximately (deleted) billion is related directly to our efforts in South Vietnam."

U.S. air strikes in Laos have been reported to run up to 600 or more sorties a day.

The transcript shows that in northern Laos the average sortie costs \$3,190 and delivers 2.2 tons of bombs. This would add up to a cost of \$1,914,000 for a day of 600 air sorties.

President Nixon on March 6 originally said that "No American stationed in Laos had ever been killed in ground combat operations." But the inquiry, confirming figures disclosed in the dispute over that statement, shows there have been "something under 200 U.S. military personnel . . . killed in Laos." Most of these were airmen, but nearly 50 are listed as "civilian and military" personnel assigned to the U.S. mission in Laos.

There are "two wars" in Laos. One is what began as a "civil war" in the north, in which the main Communist forces consist of constantly increasing numbers of North Vietnamese troops; this is the air and ground war that the American Embassy mission in Vientiane is deeply engaged in running. The other war in Laos is the American air war against the so-called Ho Chi Minh infiltration trails, running south through Laos from North to South Vietnam.



SEN. STUART SYMINGTON
... releases testimony

The Symington subcommittee was focused primarily on the war in the north. But both portions of the Laotian conflict interact with the war in Vietnam, militarily and diplomatically.

Sullivan, who worked on the 1962 Geneva accords, became ambassador to Laos in November, 1964, replacing Leonard Unger.

North Vietnam failed to comply with the 1962 Geneva neutrality agreements "from their inception," Sullivan testified, withdrawing only a token number and retaining about 6,000 troops, while the United States pulled out all its 666 men.

The United States, in November, 1962, agreed to provide supplies and repair parts for U.S.-supplied equipment and other material "as permitted" under the Geneva accords, said Sullivan. Then in 1963 North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao troops broke the accords, he said, by attacking neutralist forces and "in 1964 North Vietnam began markedly to increase its support to the (pro-Communist) Pathet Lao and its use of the Ho Chi Minh trail . . ."

"In the same spirit of proportionate response to North Vietnamese violations of the agreements," Sullivan testified, "and as part of our effort to assist South Vietnam in its defense," the United States began "air operations" and considerably expanded its ground support.

Sullivan insisted the United States is free to "terminate" its operations in Laos at any time.

The "first U.S. reconnaissance flight was flown over the north of Laos May 19, 1964, after consultation with

continued

Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma the previous day," Sullivan testified.

That was acknowledged by the United States on June 6 of that year—when the first "unarmed" plane was shot down. But armed escort planes were secretly added in the meantime; the first of these was shot down June 7, 1964.

By agreement between Souvanna and Ambassador Unger, said Sullivan, it was decided that "firing on ground targets by the escort aircraft would not be acknowledged and would be kept out of discussion with the press on grounds of being an operational matter."

"The United States began bombing of Lao territory along the Ho Chi Minh trail in early 1965," Sullivan said, initially bombing jointly with the Royal Lao Air Force.

Defending the entire U.S. operation in Laos, Sullivan said "It involves no stationing of U.S. combat forces, no commitments and, in comparison with Vietnam, a fairly modest and inconspicuous deployment of personnel and resources."

But Col. Robert L. F. Tyrell, chief U.S. air attache in Laos and actually the U.S. air operations commander there under the ambassador, testified that in addition to conducting air strikes in Laos from multiple bases in Thailand, "we have had aircraft operating from Danang, Pleiku (in South Vietnam) . . . and also from the 7th Fleet."

The air operations center in Laos is "staffed by Lao and Americans," said Tyrell.

The testimony revealed that logistics support for U.S. army and air attaches in Laos has been covertly handled from American bases in Thailand, were the "cover title" of deputy chief of the American military assistance group in Thailand conceals the Laos support function.

In Thailand, Lao are taught to fly, their troops are trained, their planes are repaired.

The testimony also showed that President Nixon's March 6 statement about the number of Americans "stationed" in Laos hides the fact that other American personnel—the number was censored—"drift in and out" of Laos on "temporary" assignment.

Sullivan testified: "The original understanding between my predecessor and the Prime Minister of Laos was premised upon statements being limited admissions publicly stated

being very carefully structured."

The agreement held admirably for six years. The Russians knew what was going on, the record shows; so did the North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao. The American public was dependent upon its newsmen—if they could pierce the secrecy barrier.

Sullivan gave the administration's principal explanation for official secrecy about American operations in Laos: to maintain the "initial understanding we had with the Soviets" in 1962 about neutralizing Laos. Even if a Soviet official "reads things in the newspapers . . . he does not have to take any official cognizance of them. But if they are made directly by U.S. officials he does have to take cognizance of them."

For the United States to admit officially what it is doing in Laos, while North Vietnam continues to deny it has some 67,000 troops there, said Sullivan, "gives them a totally unfair, totally legal protection."

"In the meantime you are deceiving the American people and the Congress," countered Sen. J. W. Fulbright.

Similarly, Sen. Symington said: "We say we are an open society, and the enemy is a closed society . . . Here we are telling Americans they must fight and die to maintain an open society, but not telling our people what we are doing."

Sullivan countered, "I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I consider these hearings as a very sincere token of an open society."

Symington, who is a member of both the Senate Armed Services Committee and Foreign Relations Committee and has inspected U.S. operations in Laos, was surprised to find that these activities were greater than he knew.

He told Sullivan that he had not known that U.S. forward air controllers "were working with Laotian troops in the planes with them, targeting Laotian bombers."

The record showed the American forward air controllers were not even requested by the Laotians, but that the U.S. "country team determined they were necessary . . ."

A similar indication of American control at both the requesting and the complying ends of U.S. operations in Laos was testimony that Gen. Vang Pao "was considering moving lines" but the American Embassy urged him "to contin-

ue." He did.

Symington said he discovered in 1965, when he was in Southeast Asia during the 37-day halt in the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam, that in "one day there were, nevertheless, 378 strikes against Laos, so that must have meant, at that time, the planes which had been hitting North Vietnam were shifted to hitting Laos."

"Heavy Escalation"

In 1969, he said "the figures which Col. Tyrell shows emphasize there has been a heavy escalation of our military effort in Laos."

The record disclosed that the United States is not only paying more than half the cost of operating the Royal Government of Laos, but until this year it was paying, as well, two-thirds of the costs of operating all of the Laotian embassies in foreign countries.

Symington said that as the result of the transformation that Laos has experienced through the U.S. involvement in its war, it is now "impossible for Laos to live without the United States."

April 14, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

aerospace industry can make a meaningful long-range contribution in pre-fabricated housing field, especially in the electrical, water and air cooling systems for such homes. . . . aerospace management and workers who can build 30 engines for Apollo 11 most certainly have the work experience and required skills to move in the direction of providing a new power source for automobiles . . . a power source that is cheap, effective and clean. And certainly a team that can 'house' astronauts can come up with a mass rapid transit vehicle to 'house' commuters, especially for those who lack job opportunities because of no serviceable public transportation."

We are attempting to say that we must view a healthy employment picture in terms of a balanced, diversified economy, recognizing that national security is an all encompassing concept. We must bring balance and reason into economic growth . . . we must bring enlightenment and imagination into our policy decisions.

Perhaps a young 17th Century French philosopher and mathematician said it all when he observed: "We do not display greatness by going to one extreme, but in touching both at once, and filling all the intervening space."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we appreciate your kind attention to our remarks and again wish to commend you for holding hearings on the most vital issue of the day.

Thank you.

LAOS—NEXT STEP IN THE BIG MUDDY

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I invite attention to an excellent article on Laos, written by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) which was published in the Nation on March 30, 1970.

The article, subtitled "Next Step in the Big Muddy," lucidly sets forth the hazards of the Laos situation and the danger that the United States might be drawn into a wider war in Southeast Asia. I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRANSTON's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAOS: NEXT STEP IN THE BIG MUDDY (By Senator ALAN CRANSTON)

WASHINGTON.—The people spoke in 1968, and they spoke against the war in Vietnam. But now it is 1970, and American men are still fighting and dying there. Some troops have been withdrawn, but the Nixon Administration has never made it plain that it intends to get all our fighting men out of Vietnam, this year, next year, or any year. It, like the administration before it, seems either unable or unwilling to muster the courage to change our course.

Now there looms the danger of a new Vietnam in Laos. The war in Laos and the war in Vietnam are separate parts of the same conflict.

The Administration, it seems to me, is pursuing a double-risk policy that could keep American troops in Southeast Asia for years. On the one hand, there is convincing evidence that U.S. military involvement in Laos is being escalated in much the same way that we escalated in Vietnam in 1964. On the other hand, Vietnamization is beginning to look more and more like a convenient way for us to create an army of South Vietnamese mercenaries to continue a conflict that is neither in our national interests nor in those of the Vietnamese people.

The war between Communist and other factions in Laos had been sputtering along in

a sleepy fashion for years, both sides taking pains to avoid each other whenever possible. Sometimes one side would win, sometimes the other; it depended on the season of the year and the zeal of the local commanders.

In recent years, however, there have been alarming changes in the situation. The United States has created a secret mercenary army of Meo tribesmen. It is commanded by Laotian officers, but its men are recruited, paid, armed, trained and advised by the CIA, and by U.S. military officers. The regular Laotian army seems to have been replaced on the battle lines by these Meo mercenaries. Thai, Nationalist Chinese and Filipino troops also are reported in Laos.

Last summer, the Meo went on the offensive and overran North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao positions on the Plain of Jars. The Meo displayed more initiative and determination than is generally seen in Laos. Predictably, the offensive alarmed the other side. A counterattack was launched and during the last few weeks, our badly extended mercenaries were pushed back. So the violence on the ground has increased, in part because of American involvement in the war.

While U.S. efforts were helping to escalate the ground war in Laos, American planes were stepping up the air war at an incredible rate. American air activity there jumped from 4,500 sorties a month when the United States was still bombing North Vietnam, to between 12,500 and 15,000 a month today. Much of the increase is our response to expanded use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail by the North Vietnamese, but American bombing missions into other parts of Laos are also significant factors.

The exact nature of the bombing is not known because, like the other aspects of our involvement in Laos, the operations are shrouded in secrecy. In almost every way, the war in Laos has been a secret war. The Administration has kept it that way because the United States signed a treaty declaring we would keep our military personnel out of Laos.

Specifically, the Geneva Accords, signed by the United States and thirteen other countries in 1962, state that "the introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign para-military formations and foreign military personnel into Laos is prohibited." The treaty defines foreign military personnel to include "members of foreign military missions, foreign military advisors, experts, instructors, consultants, technicians, observers and any other foreign military persons. . . ."

In short, the United States is violating the Geneva Accords and has been violating them for many years. So the Administration has tried to keep the press at bay and to avoid testifying publicly on the real nature of our involvement in Laos.

The Communists, of course, know what we are doing. It's no military secret to them that we bomb them or that our mercenaries attack them. The Communists are violating the Geneva Accords—and won't admit it. The United States is violating the Accords—and won't admit it.

"Civilian" pilots hired by the CIA and AID fly our mercenaries and their supplies around the country, and the government covers the whole thing up as a relief operation to provide supplies for refugees. When the planes are shot down, the embassy in Vientiane simply attributes their loss to bad weather conditions. The Administration conveniently forgets how this practice distorts and perverts the whole concept of foreign assistance.

Meanwhile, our military planes blast away from the air with a considerable degree of immunity. There are those who seem really not to care if the same friendly village is hit three times—as actually happened in Laos—or if women and children in unfriendly villages are burned to death. Money for the secret army and the disguised air flights is buried in CIA and AID budgets, hidden from

the people and their elected representatives.

A congenial host perpetuates this sham by piously repeating from time to time that "there are no foreign troops in Laos except North Vietnamese." Souvanna Phouma knows perfectly well that his statement is nonsense. Enterprising reporters have proved it nonsense. Senators and Representatives know it is nonsense—and are asking the Administration to set the record straight.

President Nixon has responded by issuing what he calls a precise description of American activities in Laos. He reported, among other things, that "no American stationed in Laos has ever been killed in ground combat operations." A day later, the *Los Angeles Times* disclosed that Capt. Joseph K. Bush, Jr., an American military adviser, was killed in ground combat at Muong Soui, on the western edge of the Plain of Jars, on February 11, 1969. The White House acknowledged that Captain Bush had been killed by hostile fire, and stated that the President had not been told of his death. He, like the American public, learned about it from an American press which, fortunately, has refused to be intimidated by the Administration's efforts to soften or silence its reporting of the wars in Southeast Asia.

The White House then went on to argue that Captain Bush was not killed in Laotian "ground combat operations." However, he was awarded a Silver Star posthumously, and the citation says that he killed two enemy soldiers before he fell while defending a compound at Muong Soui.

It is impossible, perhaps, to define "ground combat," there being so many ways to interpret the mission of men who, in fact, engage in ground combat. But there is a second nicety of definition in Mr. Nixon's statement that we must not gloss over. The three key words are "stationed in Laos."

I have asked the President how many men not "stationed in Laos" have been killed there. The question needs answering because I have talked with young Americans who were stationed in Vietnam and who tell me they were sent across the border into Laos. They say they were armed, and on military missions. They say they were under orders that, if captured, they were to tell the enemy that they had become lost, misread their maps, and strayed into Laos. They were to say that they thought all along that they were inside Vietnam.

One former GI tells me he was sent with others to pick up American dead in Laos and to bring them back to Vietnam. The slain would then be counted as casualties in Vietnam, not casualties in Laos.

The President's statement on Laos also sought to persuade us that most of the intervention on the ground in Laos is by North Vietnam, not by the United States. He declared that 67,000 North Vietnamese troops are in Laos, and compared this to what he declared to be a total of 1,040 Americans directly employed by the U.S. Government in Laos, or employed on contract by our government, or by government contractors, in Laos. But Mr. Nixon made no reference to our army of Meo mercenaries. They change the comparison considerably. Estimates of Meo troop strength run as high as 40,000 men. I have asked the President to divulge the maximum number of Meo tribesmen that have been on the American payroll during the Johnson administration, and during his own Administration.

There are those in the present Administration who seem determined to make another bad little war into another bad big war. But it won't be as easy to embroil the nation as deeply in Laos as it has become embroiled in Vietnam. The U.S. Senate has made it more difficult for this Administration—or any administration—to send full battalions and divisions of American troops into Laos. Congress adopted an amendment to the Armed Services Appropriations bill,

April 14, 1970

offered by Sen. Frank Church of Idaho, stipulating that none of its funds could be used to introduce ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand without prior consent of Congress.

But even with the Senate amendment, even with the strong concern and criticism in Congress, and the accurate and determined reporting by the press, we're already knee-deep in a new Big Muddy.

Meanwhile, the old Big Muddy oozes along, sucking up lives and dollars at a steady rate. There is a great danger that the Nixon Administration still seeks victory in Vietnam; at the least, it is obviously planning to use American artillerymen, airmen and support troops to prolong the conflict.

Under Richard Nixon, Vietnamization has become just another way of paying foreign troops to fight a war the Administration wants to wage. In Laos we hire mercenaries; in Vietnam a more sophisticated method is used. The Saigon generals forcibly conscript Vietnamese boys into their army. We pay their salaries indirectly through foreign assistance; we provide their arms, equipment and training directly. Then these youngsters go out and do the dirty work for us and for the repressive dictatorship which most of them dislike and distrust. The dirty work, of course, is to kill other Vietnamese.

The President's form of Vietnamization will not end the war. It will prolong it. His form of Vietnamization does not mean that we are going to pull all our troops out. Some—including combat troops—will be in Vietnam indefinitely. A secret timetable is not a timetable at all; it is a device whereby an administration attempts to claim credit for the things it does, meanwhile hiding all that it isn't doing or could be doing faster. It is as if a railroad announced that all its trains were running on time—but refused to publish a timetable.

President Nixon's form of Vietnamization means we shall continue to prop up the Thieu-Ky clique—as repressive and unrepresentative today as it has ever been. I would support a policy of providing a truly representative government in South Vietnam with enough assistance to match the outside assistance given to insurgents who seek its overthrow. But the sad fact is that there is no representative government in Saigon, nor any sign that one will emerge in the future. The sad fact is that, instead of moving toward peace in Vietnam, we are simply moving toward another kind of war—a war that resembles on a much larger scale the conflict in Laos.

Unlike the war in Laos, the war in Vietnam is no secret. The American people are aware of it, hate it, and want us to get out of it. After a grace period for the Nixon Administration that lasted ten months, Americans and their elected officials renewed their demands for an end to that war.

Reacting to this pressure, the Administration began the gradual withdrawal of front-line American combat troops—while our air and support troops remain the same. Fewer American lives are being lost, the number of troops in Vietnam is going down instead of up, and the immediacy of the war begins to fade from public concern.

To keep it fading, the Administration has attacked the mass media—which has reported the war to the American people as its reporters have seen it. At the same time, reporters in Laos who tried to tell the story found that they had thereby forfeited some of their rights to protection as American citizens.

On February 24, the press reported that one plane per minute was leaving the secret American-run base at Long Cheng in Laos. It also revealed that many armed Americans in civilian clothes were active in the battle then sputtering on the Plain of Jars. The plucky

reporters who filed that story were arrested by Laotians. And the American ambassador in Laos promptly declared: "The American Mission has lost any interest in the press whatsoever because of what happened this afternoon."

I was under the illusion that embassies overseas were supposed to protect American citizens, not to wash their hands of them. But the secrecy of this dirty little war has probably given Ambassador Godley the illusion that he is a Roman proconsul. It's no wonder then that he speaks more like Pontius Pilate than like an American official. It is the kind of mentality that got us into the Southeast Asian quagmire in the first place.

The American press continues to report on American activities in Laos and Vietnam. But it will take more than journalism to keep Laos from becoming another Vietnam, and to keep Vietnam from turning into a giant Laos. Specific steps must be taken:

All our fighting men must be withdrawn from both countries.

The withdrawal must be on a timetable announced in advance.

If a true representative government should come to power in South Vietnam, the United States should provide enough assistance to match the outside assistance given to insurgents seeking its overthrow.

It may be more hygienic for us at home to know that our tax dollars, which pay for bombs and napalm and foreign mercenaries, are responsible for more and more of the killing in Vietnam, and American foot soldiers for less and less. I submit that to the Vietnamese girl who is raped, it makes little difference whether Americans of South Vietnamese assault her. And it makes little difference to the people of a Vietnamese or Laotian village whether the American weapons that kill them are handled by American citizens or American mercenaries. They are dead; we helped kill them. Surely that is all that counts to those who may survive.

And it is all that should count for us. No matter how you slice it, or paper it over, or patch it up, this is an unjust, immoral and unnecessary war. I am truly sorry for the people of Southeast Asia who bear the burden of it. They deserve better leadership than either side in the conflict can give them. But we cannot select their governments for them, and we cannot order their societies for them. That is their responsibility, not ours.

Our first responsibility is to peace. The Nixon policy will not bring peace—it will only bring more war and more killing. As long as we continue to support an unpopular government in Saigon and as long as we refuse to send a top-level negotiator to Paris, there will be no peace in Vietnam.

Our second responsibility is to ourselves. And we cannot begin to meet that responsibility until we get our troops all the way out of Southeast Asia. The issue is not whether Americans fight the war or Vietnamese fight the war. The issue is the war itself. The issue cannot be diffused. It will not go away.

It will haunt the dreams of a generation of Americans for years to come. We shall not be whole again until it is ended. We must at last be true to the best of our heritage, not to the worst.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in April 1940, the Soviet Union cruelly and ruthlessly murdered more than 15,000 Polish officers. These young men were completely defenseless, having been captured during the Stalin-Hitler rape of Poland which began in September 1939. The site of this infamous deed is a name which still brings shudders of revulsion to free

men: The mass graves were located in the Katyn Forest in eastern Poland.

Invading German armies discovered the mass graves at Katyn containing more than 4,000 corpses. The International Red Cross was summoned and investigated, fixing the blame on the Russians. The Reds made an effort to lay this vicious massacre at the feet of the German armies, but subsequent investigations, including one by Congress, leave little doubt that the Soviets were responsible. We also learned that the Russians loaded more than 11,000 bodies of these young patriots on barges, sailed them into the White Sea, and sank them by shelling them.

Mr. President, on the 30th anniversary of this melancholy event, it is well for Congress to remember this tragedy and pay tribute to the brave young men who fought and died defending Polish liberty.

When we sit down to negotiate with the Soviet Union at Vienna and elsewhere, we should remember that we are dealing with a regime which countenance mass murder and used mass murder as an instrument of its national policy.

World War II began, as we know, in defense of Polish freedom. It ended in the subjugation of Poland. The Russian masters of Poland doubtless had an easier time setting up their puppet regime because of Katyn. Had these young, vigorous, talented, and freedom-loving officers survived the war, they doubtless would have opposed the tyranny of a Stalin puppet regime in 1945, just as they fought a Hitler-Stalin takeover of Poland in 1939.

WOMEN AND THE LAW

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, equal justice under law is one of the fundamental principles on which our Nation was founded. The legal realities, unfortunately, sometimes fall short of this principle.

I am speaking of legal discrimination against women.

In a most interesting article, entitled "Women and the Law," in the March issue of the Atlantic, Diane Schuder, a New York attorney, discusses flagrant injustices in the areas of employment, civil rights, welfare law, criminal law, and abortion law.

It is time to stop treating women as second-class citizens. To all persons concerned with injustice in American society, I commend this thoughtful article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WOMEN AND THE LAW

(By Diane Schuder)

The United States Constitution once blatantly described the black man as three fifths of a man and the Supreme Court decided that black people did not qualify as "citizens." Women in our legal history have not been treated much better. Most sex-discriminating laws have been explained as "protective" of women; women's innate inferiority has been assumed. The Supreme Court made this clear in 1908:

... history discloses the fact that woman